



THE NATIONAL Voter

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U. S.

1026 17th STREET, N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

What the Convention Decided

Editor's note: This is, in large part, a reference issue of the VOTER. It is important for the 106,000 League members to know what their 713 representatives decided at the national Convention. We thought you would want to see exactly what action was taken by the Convention on Program, By-laws, Platform, and officers. A summary report appears below.

IN her opening speech Mrs. Lee set the keynote which was followed by the Convention in its five days of deliberation when she said: "The course we choose must be as highly principled as our objectives. This applies equally to our By-laws, our policies, our methods, our management, our selection of program and our way of carrying out that program—to support democracy, we must be democracy."

The delegate body totalled 713, and included 611 local League delegates, 87 state League delegates, and 15 members of the national Board. Representation covered 471 local Leagues, 19 provisional Leagues, 39 state boards, the District of Columbia and Alaska. With the addition of 207 persons, which included national, state and local staffs, special visitors, Convention Committees and press, the total attendance was 939.

Mrs. Lee reported League growth over the past two years. The number of local Leagues has risen from 740 in 1950 to 824 in 1952,—an increase of 11%. The membership has gone from 93,000 in 1950 to 106,000 in 1952,—an increase of 14%. Total publication sales have jumped from \$41,128 in 1950 to \$52,269 in 1952,—an increase of 28%.

The program adopted by the Convention for 1952-54 is as follows:

The League of Women Voters, a non-partisan organization, is dedicated to the principles of self-government established in the Constitution of the United States. The League works through its Voters Service and its program to promote political responsibility through informed and active participation of citizens in government.

Voters Service is a year-round activity to help the individual citizen to be politically effective. It develops understanding of the essentials of individual liberty and representative government; it

provides non-partisan factual information on candidates and issues; it increases citizen participation in political processes in the interest of responsible and responsive government.

Current Agenda

The League of Women Voters recognizes that the building of a peaceful world, on which the security of the United States depends, is the most important issue facing the country. The League is aware that our domestic and international problems are inter-related, and it will promote understanding of their relationship. Action will concentrate on:

I. Measures which contribute to world security with emphasis on international economic advancement and maximum use of the United Nations.

II. Measures to improve the budgetary procedures of the Congress as basic to responsibility and economy in federal expenditures.*

In the discussion of the Proposed Program delegates showed substantial interest in, and desire for material on, the administration of the use of natural resources, individual liberties, the electoral college, and fiscal policies. The Convention reaffirmed League support for D.C. Home Rule and adequate appropriations for the U.N.

The Platform was amended as follows:

III-10 was amended to read "Anti-inflation measures in time of national emergency."

III-11 was added, as follows: "Fiscal measures directed toward a stable and expanding economy."

IV-4 was added, as follows: "The expansion of world trade and reduction of trade restrictions."

The Convention voted unanimously that the President be authorized to appoint a committee, composed of Board and non-Board members, to explore and make recommendations on: (1) Possible revision of the format of the Platform; (2) Possible By-law revision to provide for systematic Platform review; and (3) Formulation of a policy for action based on the Platform.

(Continued on page 2)

* These are not the precise words adopted by the Convention. The Convention authorized the Board to make such editorial changes as might seem desirable.

MAY POLL

—By L. D. Warren



Reprinted from Cincinnati Enquirer

Candidates' Meeting— After the Fact

"THE eyes and ears of fifty million Americans are on Cincinnati tonight," said one commentator. "Through the Presidential candidates forum the League of Women Voters has scored the greatest convention scoop in history," said another.

"I am proud to be even a very small part of an organization which is doing such a terrific job," wrote a League member. The president of the National Broadcasting Company, one of the original co-sponsors of the Presidential candidates' meeting, put it this way: "It seems to us at NBC that the candidates' appearance at your convention in Cincinnati and the many local forums which preceded were a remarkable public service and a genuine contribution to good citizenship."

From these comments and hundreds like them we are forced to conclude that "Citizens' View of '52" was an overwhelming success.

It was a success because six busy men in the forefront of American political life took time out from active campaigning to give thoughtful replies to the two questions citizens had chosen as most important.

It was a success because 350 Leagues accepted the challenge on very short notice and somehow worked "Citizens' View" forums into already crowded schedules.

It was a success because it fired the imagination of press and radio. Editorial after editorial across the country said in effect, "What makes it even more significant is the fact that the *people* of the country will have chosen the subject matter."

It was a success because it may establish a pattern for the future. In the words of Roscoe Drummond, of the *Christian Science Monitor*, "The League of Women Voters has tried out successfully a political technique which could be usefully adopted by the 1952 Presidential nominees—to the great advantage of the voters—as a part of the election campaign itself . . . This would be good not only for the electorate. This would be good for the democratic process. And unless . . . the nominees wanted to evade the issues, this would be good for the candidates themselves."

Although the meeting was a great success it could have been greater if all the major candidates had been able to appear. The League regrets that Senator Taft and Senator Russell, who were urged to attend, were unable to do so. They offered to send substitutes, but long experience with candidates' meetings has shown that once substitutes are accepted the meeting is likely to end as a meeting of substitutes instead of candidates.

If General Eisenhower had been in this country and actively campaigning no substitute would have been accepted for him. Forty-eight hours before the meeting another candidate who was also engaged in an important election campaign asked to withdraw and send a substitute in his stead. His request was denied and he appeared in person.

We regret that a few non-League guests in the audience expressed disapproval of remarks from the platform in a discourteous (and non-League-like) manner and did not always share the League's non-partisan approach to the meeting.

But all in all, the candidates thought the meeting was a success; our co-sponsors thought it was a success, and so did we!

CORRECTION

The May 1 VOTER contained an unfortunate error which has played havoc in the Publications Department. The new Significant Roll Calls is Publication Number 195 and sells for 25¢. Please note this change in sending your orders.

CONVENTION ACTION (Continued)

The Convention elected the slate of Officers and Directors proposed by the Nominating Committee. Mrs. Lee later announced the appointment to the Board of Directors of Mrs. Winfield Rieffler of Washington, D. C. and Mrs. Oscar M. Ruebhausen of New York, N.Y.

The national Finance Chairman reported an increase (\$90,341) in dollars spent in League work at the local, state and national levels during the past year. She noted an increase of 165 in the number of finance drives, an increase of 5,635 in the number of contributions, and an increase of \$59,693 in income from contributions.

A budget of \$210,212 was adopted. This was \$1,350 less than the proposed budget. It was felt that since 1953 was not a League Convention year this cut could be made by providing for three instead of four meetings of the Board of Directors.

The By-law amendment to Article XIII, Section 2 (a) was passed which sets the deadline date for submission of the first Program proposals one month later than the present By-laws, and reduces by two weeks the time for consideration by the Leagues of the proposed Current Agenda. There was acceptance, of the necessity of providing for four Board meetings a year.

A motion to amend the By-laws by substituting a majority for the two-thirds vote for consideration of not-recommended items was defeated.

The rest of the By-law changes recommended by the Board were approved by the Convention, with the amendment of the proposal under Article VIII, Section 6,—Transfers of Property,—to read "Any two of the following officers,—the President, the Vice Presidents and the Treasurer,—have authority to assign, endorse, etc. . . ."

A motion to amend the Article on Convention representation was defeated, but a motion was approved to authorize the President to appoint a committee to consider the problem of Convention representation, the committee to be composed of both Board and non-Board members, with geographical representation and representation of large and small Leagues. It was instructed to report to the Board by April 1953.

In closing, Mrs. Lee raised the question of the difficulty of so large a Convention acting as a deliberative body. In view of the rapidity of League growth, in membership and in number of local Leagues (30 recognized within the month of April), this is obviously an increasing problem. She did not propose any immediate change, but suggested that thought be given to the possibility of putting more responsibility on the Council which might be somewhat enlarged, and making the Convention an advisory group, providing leadership training with greater use of round tables, panel discussions, etc. She congratulated the Convention on the splendid work it had done and on the good will which had prevailed throughout. She said that, to her, the finest, healthiest, most faith-producing sight in this troubled world is the League of Women Voters.

NOTES ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

THE responsibility for the administration of the mutual security Program is vested in the Director, Mr. Averell Harriman. His office must issue the policy directives, within limits set by Congress, to carry out the purposes of the Mutual Security Act. It must decide on the allocation of money for economic and military aid to different countries and how much should be requested from Congress to continue the Program for another year. It must coordinate the work of the government agencies that directly administer different parts of the Program, and it must work out compromises when two or more agencies disagree on what should be done. Finally, the Director is responsible for seeing that no country receiving U.S. aid is exporting strategic materials to communist nations. The job is a tremendous one and since the office of the Director was only established in October 1951 it is almost too soon to determine whether it is operating with maximum effectiveness.

Very confusing to the layman is the fact that the Mutual Security Agency, (successor to ECA), of which Mr. Harriman is also head, is only one part of the Mutual Security Program, which involves also the Department of Defense and the Department of State. As Director of Mutual Security, therefore, Mr. Harriman must supervise himself as Administrator of the Mutual Security Agency. The practical solution to this problem has been to put operating responsibility for the M.S.A. in the hands of a Deputy Administrator.

What the Director Coordinates

Mr. Harriman's main task is to coordinate the work of government agencies responsible for carrying out the Mutual Security Program: The Defense Department which handles military aid; the Mutual Security Agency, which is responsible for economic aid to Western Europe and Southeast Asia; and the Technical Cooperation Administration in the State Department which handles the Point Four Program. Many people who have investigated the administration of the Mutual Security Program have asked the question: "Why should there be two agencies to administer a program of technical assistance and economic aid to underdeveloped countries?"

Two Agencies—One Program

The most obvious answer to the question is that it just happened that way. When the Point Four Program was launched in June 1950, Congress set up T.C.A. in the State Department to administer it. At the same time E.C.A. was given authority to give economic assistance to countries in the vicinity of China when it was no longer possible to give assistance to China proper. For a while during 1950 and 1951 both agencies were operating in South and Southeast Asia. Last year both Congress and the Administration decided on the policy of one country, one program. Now, at least, M.S.A. and T.C.A. are not both doing similar work in the same country. Since E.C.A. had started first in Southeast Asia, Congress allowed it, and later M.S.A., to continue.

One important difference between M.S.A. and T.C.A. is that Congress specified that any country receiving aid from the Mutual Security Agency must also be contributing to the mutual defense of the free world. Countries receiving U.S. economic aid through

T.C.A. are not required to provide military assistance for mutual defense.

T.C.A. operates under a policy that it describes as "first things first." That is, since hunger, disease, and ignorance are the greatest problems facing the underdeveloped countries, these must be tackled first. For example, T.C.A. has had great difficulty reaching agreement with Pakistan on the kind of aid to be given because that nation is interested in industrial development and does not want U.S. technicians to increase food supply as much as it wants technicians to help in building factories and in training skilled industrial workers.

The Mutual Security Agency, though also concerned with basic problems, tried last year an "impact program" of supplying countries in Southeast Asia with sufficient quantities of goods to have a noticeable immediate effect. The agency reasoned this was necessary to produce a direct impact on the communist problem. This policy was criticized on the grounds that the U.S. was giving the country what the U.S. thought was necessary and not what the country asked for; in other words, forcing aid upon the people. Presumably, M.S.A. has modified this policy and is now following the principle that a country should request aid and work out in detail the kind of projects needed to help solve its most critical problems.

Several non-governmental organizations which have studied the question of the administration of the U.S. foreign aid program think that economic aid and technical assistance to underdeveloped countries eventually ought to be completely divorced from direct military considerations. They have also suggested that a single agency should be responsible for U.S. economic aid programs. However, Congress has indicated reasonable satisfaction with the present administrative set-up of the Mutual Security Program. Consequently it will probably continue without substantial change for another year.

Box Score on the Hoover Commission

The most important of the Hoover Commission recommendations for the reorganization of the federal government to be enacted so far are:

1. Unification of the Armed Services; 2. Reorganization of the State Department; 3. Reorganization of the Labor Department; 4. Modernization of the budget and accounting systems of the federal government; 5. Creation of the General Services Administration; and 6. Reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The major recommendations which have not been acted on are:

1. Revision of federal personnel policies; 2. Reorganization of the Veterans Administration; 3. Unification of federal hospital and medical facilities; 4. Reorganization of the Department of Agriculture; 5. Merger of the civil functions of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Three Reorganization Plans recently sent to Congress will, if they are not turned down, extend civil service coverage and reorganize the Departments of Treasury and Justice and the Post Office. The Senate Committee on Government Operations is now holding hearings on these plans.

Is Inflation Really Licked?

IN general the American economy has exhibited unusual stability for the past year. Non-governmental demand for most commodities has been reduced. Buyers' markets have taken the place of sellers' markets in many lines. People are saving more of their incomes than they have in many years. Cold comfort though it may be to those whose incomes have not caught up with the price level, the fight against inflation has been remarkably successful, at least for the time being. The question now argued is: Is Inflation Really Licked? and If So, For How Long?

The Backdrop

Inflation reared its ugly head immediately following the Korean crisis; remained in full force for about a year; then started to decline. The sharp rise and more recent slight fall in the price level reflect this pattern. From June 1950 through early spring of 1951, the index of wholesale prices for all commodities rose about 16%. It had declined 3% by August and has been quite stable since then. Consumer prices, lagging behind wholesale, rose 11% from June 1950 to the end of 1951, but have today declined about 1%.

What Was Done

First Congress raised tax rates. Then in September of 1950 the Defense Production Act granted emergency powers to the President to control credit, production, distribution of materials, and, if necessary to fix wage and price ceilings. Direct wage and price controls were imposed. At the same time the monetary authorities acted to reduce the volume of credit, which was pushing up prices.

This credit control was exerted in three ways. First, under the authority of the Defense Production Act, the Federal Reserve Board set specific limits to the amount of credit that could be extended directly to installment buyers of houses, automobiles and durable household goods. Minimum down payments

and maximum payment periods were established.

Second, the volume of credit was reduced by a change in the policy of the Federal Reserve System with regard to the purchase of government securities. Previously the Federal Reserve bought at par or above, any amount of such securities that banks, insurance companies or other holders offered. This made such securities the equivalent of money in many respects, and lenders could get funds with which to increase their loans at will. Naturally credit was "easy" and loans expanded enormously after Korea. The Federal Reserve in March 1951 ceased to "peg" the prices of securities in this way. Security prices dropped somewhat and lenders were generally less willing to sell them at a loss. They were accordingly less eager to lend to the public.

Third, a voluntary credit restriction plan was set up. Bankers and other lenders entered into voluntary agreements to restrict loans according to set standards.

With the change in the economic situation, (i.e. stable or falling prices and unemployment in some industries) installment credit controls and the voluntary credit restriction plan have been suspended. The question of decontrol of commodity prices has also been raised.

Where To?

While inflation appears to have ebbed, there is cause for concern as to the course of prices in the coming year. Defense expenditures have yet to reach their peak; a deficit in the federal budget is anticipated; the extension of the Defense Production Act is still undecided; the current wage and price controversy might yet break the pattern of stabilization. Will people continue to save or start another buying spree? How much will Congress cut the budget? How fast will the appropriations actually be spent? Will wages be pushed higher? These and other factors will determine the economic future.

★ CONGRESSIONAL SPOTLIGHT ★

Mutual Security Program (S. 8036): Authorization bill for \$6,900,000,000 reported by Senate Foreign Relations Committee, sent to Senate Armed Services Committee for further study on May 5 by vote of 40-33. Bill must be returned to Senate on or before May 15. The cut made by the Foreign Relations Committee amounts to 12.66% on each item from the amounts recommended by the President.

(H.R. 7005): House Foreign Affairs Committee voted cut of \$1,010,900,000 in Administration \$7.9 billion Foreign Aid bill, May 6. Entire reduction is concentrated in European theater; 20% in military assistance program, 10% in defense support (economic aid).

Defense Production Act (H.R. 6546): Open hearings before House Banking and Currency Committee continue through May 21. Senate Banking and Currency Committee considering bill (S. 2594) in executive session.

Reorganization of Government: Senate Committee on Government operations (formerly Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department) has scheduled an open hearing on Plans #2, #3, and #4 for May 14 (See VOTER 5/1/52). President's Reorganization Plan #5 for the District of Columbia received by Congress May 1. Open hearing scheduled for May 15.

* Indicates League support.

U.N. Appropriation (H.R. 7289): House passed bill with amendment limiting the U.S. contribution to any international organization to not more than one-third of that organization's total expenses. Now being considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee in closed hearings. If House version becomes law, the U.S. contribution to the U.N. will have to be reduced \$2,563,547 next year.

D.C. Home Rule (S. 1976)*: House District Committee, Judiciary Subcommittee, voted May 9 to table this Senate-passed bill, which would have given District residents an elected city council and school board, a non-voting delegate to the House of Representatives, and a Mayor appointed by the President. At the same session the subcommittee approved the Harris-Auchincloss bill for a non-voting House delegate to be elected by District residents.

THE NATIONAL VOTER

Vol. II MAY 15, 1952 No. 4

Published by the League of Women Voters of the U. S. twice monthly during sessions of Congress, otherwise published monthly except July and August.

1026 17th Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

MRS. JOHN G. LEE, President

Editors: MRS. ALEXANDER GUYOL

MRS. ANDREW MACKAY SCOTT

Entered as second class matter, April 9, 1951, at the Post Office, Washington, D. C., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Subscription \$1.00 per year.